

Appl. No. 09/739,252

Reply to Office Action of: August 31, 2005

REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for reviewing the present application.

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's indication that any one of claims 39-40, 46, 47, 51, 52 and 54-55 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Amendments to the Claims

Claim 37 is amended incorporating the subject matter of allowable claim 39, and the subject matter of intervening claim 38. Claims 38 and 39 are therefore cancelled.

Claim 37 is also amended as suggested by the Examiner to provide antecedence for the expression "said digital circuit".

Claims 40 and 41 are amended to depend on claim 37.

Claim 49 is amended incorporating the subject matter of allowable claim 51. Claim 51 is therefore cancelled.

Claim 59 is amended replacing "memory system" with "memory device" on line 2.

No new subject matter is added by way of the above amendments.

Claim Objection

As noted above, claim 37 is amended as suggested by the Examiner to overcome this objection.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C §112

Claims 48 and 59 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

Regarding claim 48, the Examiner believes that the circuit substrate of claim 48 is different from the substrate of claim 42. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully submits that the circuit substrate mentioned in claim 48 does not have to be a separate substrate introduced in claim 42, as maintained by the Examiner.

A circuit substrate is introduced in claim 42 indicating that the conducting interface and signal path are located on the substrate. Claim 48 recites that the substrate includes a slot and claim 48 further recites that the memory system includes a memory module. The memory module has an edge connector.

Appl. No. 09/739,252

Reply to Office Action of: August 31, 2005

The connection between the memory controller and the memory module is made through a connection between the edge connector (on the module) and the slot (on the substrate). There is no restriction that the memory controller and the memory module must be located on separate circuit substrates, as the Examiner concluded. The Examiner has inferred too much from the claim limitations, and may have in fact, based the reasoning on the erroneous notion that "claim 37 requires that the memory device is located on the memory module." A careful reading would reveal that claim 37 imposes no such requirement. In fact, claim 37 makes no reference to a memory module at all. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 48 complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Regarding claim 59, firstly, "memory system" is replace by "memory device" consistent with the terminology used in parent claim 49. Secondly, claim 59 is ultimately dependent on claim 49, directed to a circuit substrate. The Examiner believes that the substrate referred to in claim 59 should be a separate substrate, "for reasons similar to those explained in the rejection to claim 48." For the same reasons presented above in response to the Examiner's rejections of claim 48, Applicant believes that claim 59 complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and that no further amendments to claim 59 are necessary.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C §103

Claims 37, 38, 41-45, 49, 50 and 56-58 have been rejected under 35 §U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonaiddi in view of Sanwo et al.

As noted above, independent claims 37 and 49 are amended to include subject matter that has been deemed allowable by the Examiner. Claims 41-45 depend from claim 41, either directly or indirectly. Similarly, claims 50 and 56-58 depend from claim 49 either directly or indirectly. Therefore, the rejections under 35 §U.S.C. 103(a) are thereby rendered moot.

Claims 48 and 59 have been rejected under 35 §U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonaiddi in view of Sanwo et al., in further view of Akram et al.

As noted above, independent claims 37 and 49 are amended to include subject matter that has been deemed allowable by the Examiner. Claims 48 and 59 are ultimately dependent on claims 37 and 49 respectively, therefore, the rejections under 35 §U.S.C. 103(a) are thereby rendered moot.

Appl. No. 09/739,252


Reply to Office Action of: August 31, 2005

Summary

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes that all pending claims, namely claims 37, 40-50 and 52-59 are now in condition for allowance.

Applicant requests early reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Sean X. Zhang
Agent for Applicant
Registration No. 56,058

Date: Feb 28, 2006

BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON LLP
Suite 2800, P.O. Box 25
199 Bay Street, Commerce Court West
Toronto, Ontario M5L 1A9
CANADA

Tel: 416.863.5839
SZH/BSL